

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed July 7, 2010. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 15, 18-20, 22-24, 27-29 and 31-32 were pending, and Claims 1-14, 16-17, 21, 25-26 and 30 were previously cancelled. In the Office Action, Claims 19, 22-24, 27-28 and 31-32 were rejected; Claims 20 and 29 were objected to; and Claims 15 and 18 were allowed. Claims 19, 24, and 28 are herein amended, and Claims 20 and 29 are herein cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15 and 18 are allowed. Applicants appreciate Examiner's consideration and indication that Claims 20 and 29 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, Applicant amends base Claim 19 incorporating the elements of allowable Claim 20. Likewise, Applicant amends base Claim 28 incorporating the elements of allowable Claim 29. Applicant submits that amended Claims 19 and 28 are in condition for allowance and requests favorable action. Claims 22 and 23 depend from Claim 19, and Claims 31 and 32 depend from Claim 28. Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable to the extent of the Claim from which they depend, respectively. Thus, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 22-23 and 31-32 are in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sheha* in view of *Briesemeister* (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,537) and further in view of *Cuny* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0141541).

Applicant respectfully traverses and submits the cited art combination, even if proper, which Applicant does not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

Applicant has amended independent Claim 24 to include limitations that the Examiner indicated would be allowable (i.e., with respect to Claims 15 and 18, and previous Claims 20 and 29). Specifically, amended independent Claim 24 now recites “wherein the PoC message includes the geographical location of the further PoC terminal device and the indicator only if a parameter controllable by the user of the further PoC terminal device shows that the geographical location may be indicated.” Applicant submits that *Sheha*, *Briesemeister*, and *Cuny* fail to teach or disclose at least this aspect of amended independent Claim 24. Thus, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance. Claim 27 depends from Claim 24, and is allowable to the extent Claim 24 is allowable. Thus, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 27.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the remarks set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicant believes no fees are due. However, should the Commissioner deem that any fees are due, including any fees for additional extensions of time, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit such fees from Deposit Account No. 50-4871.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicant's attorney at 512.457.2030.

Respectfully submitted,
KING & SPALDING LLP
Attorneys for Applicant



Eric M. Grabski
Registration No. 51,749

Date: December 7, 2010

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
KING & SPALDING LLP
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. 86528
512.457.2030
512.457.2000 (fax)